UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,307	05/25/2007	David Patrick Egan	293610US0PCT	2529
22850 7590 12/17/2008 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			EXAMINER	
			MARCHESCHI, MICHAEL A	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/17/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/586,307	EGAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael A. Marcheschi	1793
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 S</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the practice under the practice.	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1,7 and 10 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,7 and 10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the I	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati prity documents have been receive uu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/30/08 has been entered.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 is indefinite because it depends on a canceled claim.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The new matter added to claim 1 is the limitation that the metal of the inner layer is Ni because the specification, as originally filed does not provide support for this specific species.

Since the other claims depend on claim 1, they are also rejected for the above reasons.

This rejection was previously applied and not responded to.

Claims 1, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over EP 532261 in view of Chen (865).

The EP reference teaches in the abstract, page 3, lines 17-18 and the claims, boron nitride particles coated with a primary layer (carbide inner layer (chromium, etc.)) and an outer layer of a metal alloy (tungsten, titanium, etc. and an alloy is made up of more than one metal-this reads on the claimed mixture of titanium and tungsten).

Although the EP reference does not coat diamonds but rather cBN, it is well established in the coating of superabrasive grains, that either diamond or cBN grains can be coated with similar coatings (i.e. first coating being a carbide forming metal and the second layer being a metallic coating), as is evidenced by the secondary reference the claim 1, thus the substitution of diamond for cBN as the abrasive to be coated with the layers of the EP reference is clearly well within the scope of the skilled artisan (i.e. the secondary reference clearly teaches that diamond or cBN can be coated with similar coatings and one skilled in the art would have clearly appreciated that this concept of coating diamonds, as well as cBN, can be applicable to the disclosure of the EP reference) absent clear and critical evidence to the contrary. The examiner

has established a clear prima facie case of obviousness and burden is shifted to applicants to establish clear proof as to why one skilled in the art would not or could not, under any circumstances, be motivated to interchange one base particle for another when both are known to be coated with similar substances.

Claims 1, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Matarrese (523).

The reference teaches in the abstract, column 4, lines 11-14 and column 5, lines 14-21, diamond pellets coated with an inner layer of a carbide forming material (i.e. thus will be a carbide layer, such as titanium carbide or chromium carbide) and an over coating on the inner layer, where the over coating is a metal selected from titanium, copper, tungsten and mixtures thereof.

In view of the teachings of the reference, the claimed invention is anticipated by said reference teachings.

Applicant's arguments with respect to all the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejections.

It is to be noted that applicants fail to argue the previous rejection of claims 1, 7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The previous nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejections based on copending Application No. 10/586,394 are withdrawn because this application is now abandoned.

Application/Control Number: 10/586,307

Art Unit: 1793

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael A. Marcheschi whose telephone number is (571) 272-1374. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael A Marcheschi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Page 5